



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

it makes no provision for brothers and sisters, and does not say in what way the facts of relationship are to be established. Under this provision a husband might abandon an illiterate wife and find an absolutely safe retreat in this country. It also assumes that the relatives of an immigrant entitled to come would in all cases become a public charge unless supported by him, which is not true.

The provision of the bill intended to keep Canadian laborers from crossing the line into the United States and obtaining regular employment, while retaining their home beyond the line, is characterized as "illiberal, narrow and un-American." The language of the veto on this point is as follows:

"When we consider these provisions of the bill, in connection with our long northern frontier and the boundaries of several of our states and territories, often but an imaginary line separating them from the British dominions, and recall the friendly intercourse between the people who are neighbors on either side, the provisions of this bill affecting them must be regarded as illiberal, narrow and un-American.

The residents of these states and territories have separate and special interests, which in many cases make an interchange of labor between their people and their alien neighbors most important, frequently with the advantage largely in favor of our citizens. This suggests the inexpediency of federal interference with these conditions when not necessary to the correction of a substantial evil affecting the general welfare. Such unfriendly legislation as is proposed could hardly fail to provoke retaliatory measures, to the injury of many of our citizens who now find employment on adjoining foreign soil."

On this last point, Mr. Cleveland is clearly in the right. There is no imaginable excuse found in the relations of the citizens dwelling on the border for making it a crime against the law for citizens of Canada to come across and obtain employment from time to time in the territory of the United States. If our citizens or corporations did not want them and need them, they would not hire them. This unworthy thrust at Canada in the bill ought to have secured its defeat, even if it had been good in all other particulars.

The problem of immigrants at the present time is confessedly a difficult one. But any attempted solution of it which makes no further provision for the improvement of the millions of illiterate and as yet un-Americanized foreigners already here, can hardly be called a solution. Again there is no reason to believe that those who may hereafter come will be worse than those who have already arrived, but rather the contrary. There is likely also to be an actual falling off in the numbers of those coming, as recent statistics show. Besides this, the educational facilities of our States are much better than they were twenty years ago and are constantly improving, so that it will be possible hereafter to educate immigrants more rapidly than in the past. Facilities for cheap transpor-

tation into the less densely populated portions of the West are likewise better than formerly. We are certainly better able on the whole to take care of and transform rapidly into Americans those now coming than we were those who came some years ago, even if they do come faster. It must be remembered, too, that we have shown an extraordinary capacity for turning these foreigners into good, intelligent, patriotic citizens after a generation or two, and it cannot be shown that, at the present time, on the whole, after the influx which we have received, our institutions are weaker or less respected than they have heretofore been. Taking the country at large, we believe they are distinctly stronger than they have ever before been. We have no objection to a simple reading and writing test being tried in the case of all immigrants over sixteen years of age, though we doubt seriously whether such a test would do much for the general improvement of the character of those who would come. It would certainly for a time lessen the number, and this in itself would be an advantage. But if such a test is tried, it ought not to be in a complicated way, as was proposed in the vetoed bill. It ought to be a simple and unconditional test. If such a statute were enacted, it would soon become known abroad, and families intending to immigrate would make an extra effort to learn to read and write, so that there would probably be not much greater hardship on account of separation of families than is now the case, and possibly less. There is nearly as strong ground for applying the reading and writing test to the wife as to the husband.

This bill passed the Senate by only three majority. It is questionable whether a majority of the citizens of the United States are in favor of any such restrictive measure. If none such is enacted, and the present law remains in force, we shall not by any means expect to see the country go down under the weight of the ship loads of foreigners who are weekly landing on our shores. If our American civilization has not religious and political vitality and strength enough to bear up under this burden, it is perilously near ruined already and will soon sink under the weight of some other load.

#### ADIN BALLOU AND TOLSTOÏ.

A good deal of interest has been awakened by a recent remark of Hon. Andrew D. White at Harvard University that he was told in Russia by Tolstoï that the American author who interested him (Tolstoï) most was Hosea Ballou. A number of communications have appeared in the *Boston Herald* claiming that the man meant was Adin and not Hosea Ballou. However the mistake may have occurred, we have no doubt that it was Adin Ballou whom Tolstoï meant, as he not only agreed with Tolstoï in the doctrine of non-resistance but was also in frequent correspondence with the Russian reformer. The follow-

ing letter written by Adin Ballou to Mr. Joseph A. Allen of Medfield, Mass., in 1881 will be of interest to those who desire to know more about the position taken by him on the subject of war:

HOPEDALE, MASS., March 3, 1881.

DEAR SIR AND FRIEND:

I was pleased to receive your kind communication of 2d inst., by that day's evening mail. I am glad to know that you cherish reminiscences of the peace testimonies which were borne by faithful witnesses in the days of your youth and that you are not delighted with the war mania of the age. Samuel J. May was a noble specimen of enlightened humanity a rare model of rational religion, and far in advance of his denomination in practical Christianity. I knew, loved, sympathized with and honored him as a congenial collaborer in every movement that promised the regeneration of mankind.

There were other kindred spirits in those days whose aspirations, convictions and ideals were of similar genus. Still others, more numerous, caught glimpses of the heavenly light, so as to write, preach and pray occasionally for the reign of peace. But most of these germinated the seed on stony ground with small depth of soil, and endured only for a season. When the war of the rebellion came, they found plenty of reasons for renouncing their *peaceism* and resorting to *righteous* war. Since then they have been quite consistent with their apostacy, and now rush along with the multitude in glorifying and perpetuating war institutions as indispensable to so-called civilization. Hence the whole land bristles with monuments in commemoration of warriors, literature teems with martial panegyric, religion consecrates *holy* brute force, philosophy reasons out its necessity for an indefinite future, and politicians fatten on the carcasses of slaughtered myriads. The church is the obsequious handmaid of the state, and knows no moral law, Lord or Master above the semi-barbaric human governments to which it looks up for dictation and protection. As to Christ, he is a mere figurehead; and the sermon on the mount a tissue of impracticable precepts. Mars, Mammon and worldly Pleasure are in the ascendant, and the rising generation are being trained to dream of nothing better. Hence the exhibition in Boston to which you refer, and which vividly illustrates the popular sentiment.

But the end is not yet. This evil seed will one day yield its legitimate harvest of woes. It took chattel slavery in this country over two hundred years to ripen for harvest. It was nursed, cherished and protected by church and state all the while. Wealth-seekers, politicians and the populace clung to it with a lustful grasp, North as well as South, till the pampered vixen maddened in their embrace, and threatened ruin to her votaries. Then what an outburst of *patriotism* pro et con! Then with what sublime virtue was the union saved *without* slavery because it could not be saved *with* it! And then, now and forevermore, what glorifications of *righteous war* because it destroyed the pet monster it had so long fondled! Therefore, what can be a plainer or grander duty henceforth than "in time of peace to prepare for war," and to discipline the rising generation for slaughter! Such is our refined nineteenth century barbarism! Whosoever is of this world as it is, let him fall into line, and shout for old Mars, the civilizing god!

I remain in my tent afar off, till summoned to a better country. You will readily infer from the foregoing where I stand. I am confirmed beyond a doubt in the divine principles of love, peace and fraternity you heard me preach at Syracuse. I have never seen one good reason to recant them or swerve from them; and I am perfectly assured that in the fulness of times they will come uppermost with the human race. Till then poor humanity will have to seethe and boil in the Gehenna of selfishness, rivalry and war. So it chooses, and so it must fare—reaping as it sows. But though I seem silent and lost in obscurity, I am not idle. I am preparing numerous written testimonies for press, which may profit the world after I have passed into the immortal state. At no distant day there will rise a regenerated Christian Church, devoted to Christlike principles and practices. That church will *lead*, not *slavishly follow*, worldly government, civilization and society. It will uncompromisingly set the example of what the whole world must *do* and *be* to realize the fulfilment of the prayer, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth as it is done in heaven." For this regenerate Christian Church I am doing silent preliminary work.

With kind and respectful regards, I am your friend.

ADIN BALLOU.

---

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Annual Business Meeting of the American Peace Society, for the election of officers, the receiving of the reports of the Board of Directors and of the Treasurer, etc., will be held in Pilgrim Hall, Congregational House, 1 Beacon Street, Boston, on Wednesday, May 12, at 2.30 P. M. It is hoped that all members of the Society who are within reach of Boston will make a special effort to be present.

In his farewell speech at the banquet given in his honor at the Mansion House, London, on the 2d of March, Mr. Bayard, who, whatever may be thought of some so-called indiscretions in his speeches, has been one of the very best and noblest ambassadors this country has ever had at the court of St. James, spoke thus of the lesson which both the United States and Great Britain may gather from the fact that along the border between this country and Canada there has not for eighty-five years "been heard the sound of a hostile gun:

"Why should we not gather from the history of your country and mine the wisdom of example? For eighty-five years, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the grand river St. Lawrence across the lakes there has been an imaginary boundary of 4000 miles between the territory of Great Britain and the United States, and in those eighty-five years there has never been heard the sound of a hostile gun. Talk about the necessity of exaggerated military armaments! Surely between these two countries there stands an example that there is something better than arms, however nobly and grandly arms may be illustrated. States have been safe without armaments on the continent of North America for nearly a century. I do